

JOURNAL

OF THE

ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL.

Part I.—HISTORY, LITERATURE, &c.

No. I.—1896.

On Irregular Causal Verbs in the Indo-Aryan Vernaculars.—By

G. A. GRIERSON, C.I.E., PH.D.

[Read March, 1896].

In the Modern Vernaculars of Western and Central India, certain causal verbs insert a *ḍ*, an *r*, an *l*, or an *n*, before or after the causal suffix. As an example I may quote the Hindi causal verb *di-l-ānā*, 'to cause to give,' derived from *dēnā*, 'to give.'

The following is a brief summary of the distribution of these, so-called, irregular forms.

NORTH-WESTERN FAMILY.

Sindhī. In verbs ending in *i*, *u* or *ih*, and certain others, e.g., ✓ *sikh* 'to learn,' *r* is inserted after the causal *ā*. E.g., ✓ *ḍḍi*, 'give,' causal, ✓ *ḍḍiā-r*; ✓ *sikh*, 'learn,' causal ✓ *sikhā-r*. If a root ends in *ā*, *r* is inserted *before* the causal *ā*.

Kāṣmīrī. Many verbs insert *an* before the causal *āv*; e.g. ✓ *pak-an-āv* from ✓ *pak*, 'go.' Monosyllabic roots in *k*, *m*, *l* and *ṣ*, insert *r* before the causal *āv*, thus ✓ *bal-r-āv*, 'heal,' from ✓ *bal*, 'be convalescent.'

Western Pañjābī. Several verbs insert an *l* before the causal *āv* e.g., ✓ *sikh-l-āv*, 'teach,' ✓ *pi-l-āv*, 'cause to drink,' from ✓ *pī*, 'drink.' Sometimes the *l* is inserted in the middle of the root as an infix, e.g., from ✓ *samh* 'sleep,' caus. ✓ *samlāh*, from ✓ *bah*, 'sit,' caus. ✓ *balhāv*.

CENTRAL FAMILY.

WEST CENTRAL GROUP.

Eastern Pañjābī. Here in many verbs the causal suffix *āu* is changed to *lāu* or *āl*. E. g., ✓ *sikkh*, causal, ✓ *sikkhā-l* or ✓ *sikkh-l-āu* (also spelt *sikkh-āl* *sikkh-l-āu*).

Gujarātī. When the root contains any vowel except *a* or *ā*, the causal suffix becomes *ā-d*; e. g., ✓ *bēs*, 'set,' causal, *bes-ā-d*. If such a root ends with a vowel or *h*, the causal suffix is *vā-d*, e. g., ✓ *lē*, 'take,' causal, *le-vā-d*.

Rājputānī. Certain monosyllabic roots, ending in a vowel take *r-āv* as the causal suffix; e. g., ✓ *dē*, 'give,' causal ✓ *dī-r-āv*.

Hindī. Monosyllabic roots ending in a vowel change the causal suffix to *lā*; e. g., ✓ *dē*, causal ✓ *dī-l-ā*. So also ✓ *sikh*, causal ✓ *sikh-l-ā* or ✓ *sikh-ā-l* (dial.) (Old Braj ✓ *sikh-ā-r*).

These irregular forms do not occur in the Northern Group, nor in the Eastern Family (including Marāṭhī).

The origin of these forms has hitherto been considered obscure. Beames (Cp. Gr., ii. 81) says that they start 'I know not whence, but probably from a method in use in early Aryan speech, which has only been preserved by the classical language in a few instances.' He then suggests that it is not impossible, and indeed it is highly probable, that the forms are connected by an interchange between the two semi-vowels *l* and *v*. Hoernle (Gd. Gr., 320) says, 'the origin of these strange forms is very obscure.' He rejects Beames' hypothesis, but gives none of his own, beyond pointing out that certain Prakrit causals insert the letter *ḍ*.

Before proceeding to suggest an explanation, I must add another parallel form which has not been noticed by writers in this connexion. In the Mārwarī dialect of Rājputānī, certain verbs insert an *r* before *ij*, the suffix which forms the passive. Thus the passive of *lēṇō* 'to take' is *li-r-ijṇō*, and of *dēṇō* 'to give' *dī-r-ijṇō*.

In Sanskrit, many verbs add consonants (usually nasals) to their roots to form the present stem. This, indeed, is not peculiar to Sanskrit, but occurs throughout all Aryan languages. In Sanskrit, however, some of these consonantal root suffixes or infixes are formally recognized by grammarians, and are then called class suffixes (*na*, *nā* and *nu*), and serve as the basis of arrangement of the verbal conjugation. Examples are, (suffixes) *kri-ṇā-ti*, 'he buys,' *su-nō-ti*, 'he squeezes out,' (infix) *yu-na-k-ti*, 'he joins.' When *na* is suffixed, the verb is not considered to belong to any special class, but is conjugated in the 1st or 6th class, thus *vē-na-ti* (Cl. I), 'he is anxious,' *pa-na-ti*

(Cl. I), 'he bargains,' *mṛ-ṇa-ti* (Cl. VI), 'he kills.'¹ Frequently this nasal suffix gives a causal meaning; e.g., from \sqrt{mr} 'die,' we have *marati* (Vedic), 'he dies,' but *mṛ-ṇa-ti* or *mṛ-ṇā-ti*, 'he kills.'

Sometimes the suffix takes the form *ana*. Thus from the root *kṛp*, 'have pity,' we have for causal, *kṛp-ṇya-ti* or *kṛp-āp-aya-ti*, 'he is weak,' and *kṛp-āṇa-tē*, 'he is a suppliant.' Again \sqrt{is} , *iṣ-a-tē*, 'he escapes,' *iṣ-ya-ti* or *iṣ-ṇā-ti* 'he impels,' *iṣ-āṇa-ya-tē*, 'he excites.' So also, we have another group of verbs which take *anya*. E.g., *kṛp-anya-ti*, 'he is a suppliant;' *iṣ-anya-ti*, 'he excites;' *tur-a-ti* or *tur-anya-ti*, 'he hastens;' *bhur-a-ti* or *bhur-anya-ti*, 'he is active;' *di-dhēṣ-ti*, 'he sounds,' *dhiṣ-anya-t* (pres. part.) 'desirous to praise;' *rēṣ-a-ti* or *riṣ-anya-ti*, 'he injures,' *ruv-a-ti* (Ved.) or *ruv-anya-ti* 'he utters a harsh noise;' *hṇay-a-ti* or *huv-anya-ti*, 'he cries out.' Most of these (especially those with *ana* and *anya*) are recognized by native grammarians as denominative verbs. But, as Brugmann (l. c.) says, all these nasalised verbs are denominatives; *kṛi-ṇā-ti*, *su-nō-ti* and *yu-na-k-ti*, are as much denominatives as *vē-na-ti* (from *vē-na*, 'anxious') or *kṛp-āṇa-tē* (from *kṛp-āṇa*, pitiable). That is to say, in Sanskrit, verbal roots can take as suffixes (especially in the case of Denominatives and Causals) certain suffixes which are generally used to form nouns, before adding the personal terminations. The suffixes hitherto examined in regard to this, are *na*, *nā*, *ana*, *anya* and *nu*. These are all well-known nominal suffixes.

If these nominal suffixes are added in Sanskrit, it need not surprise us to find others similarly used in the old Vulgar Aryan speech of which we have survivals in the Prakrits. For instance, there is the Prakrit pleonastic suffix *ala*, *alla*, *illa* or *ulla* (H.-c., ii, 164, 165, 166, 173; iv, 429, 430). This can be added to a noun without changing its sense, and, by parity of reason, can also be added to a verbal root. Two instances of the use of this suffix attached to verbs occur in Sanskrit. The $\sqrt{pā}$ 'protect,' has two forms of conjugation, viz., *pā-ti* and *pā-l-aya-ti*, 'he protects.' The latter form is said, by European writers, to be a denominative derived from *pāla*, 'a protector;' but that, if the truth, is only half the truth. It is just as much a denominative as *vē-na-ti*, and no more. So also the $\sqrt{lī}$ or *lā*,² 'to adhere,' has for its causal $\sqrt{lā-p-aya-ti}$, *lī-n-aya-ti* or *lā-l-aya-ti*. Here there is no question of the verb being denominative. It is a pure causal formation.

Other pleonastic suffixes added in Prakrit to nouns are *ḍa* (H.-c., iv, 429, 430), and *ka* (H.-c., ii, 164; iv, 429, 430). There is no reason

¹ Brugmann, *Grundriss*, ii, 972, 973, 979, 986, 1089. These references are made once for all, and will not be repeated.

² I quote from Benfey's *Grammar*, Second Edition, p. 41. The *Siddh. Kaumudī*, ii, p. 193; Pa, 7, 3, 39, gives $\sqrt{lā}$. The point is immaterial.

why these should not be added to verbal roots, as we have seen to be the case with *na* and *la*.¹

A remarkable instance of this has survived in the Indo-Aryan Vernaculars. There is an Aryan root *der*, 'run,' which appears in Sanskrit as *drā-ti*, 'he runs.' To this root, pleonastic suffixes have been added even in Sanskrit times, so that we also find the forms *dr-ava-ti* and *dr-ama-ti*, 'he runs,' and even with more than one suffix *dr-ava-s-ya-ti*, 'he attends upon a person.' This root appears under the following forms in the modern Indian languages:—

Kāçmīrī, *dōrī*, 'he will run.'

Western Pañjābī, *drukē*, 'he runs.'

Sindhī, *dōrē* or *dōkē*.

Pañjābī, *daurē*.

Gujarātī, *dōdē*.

Rājputānī, *dōdē*.

Hindī, *daurē*, *dhaurē*.

Central Pahārī, not noted.

Naipālī, *dugurē*.

Baiswārī, *dōrē*.

Bihārī, *daugē*, *dhauē*, *dhaurē*.

Marāṭhī, *daudē*.

Bengalī, *daurē*.

Assamese, not noted.

Oriyā, *daurē*.

Here we have the following groups:—

(1) *druk*, *dōk*, *daug*, *dhauē*,²

(2) *dōr*, *dōrē*, *daur*, *dōd*, *dhaur*,² *daud*,

(3) *dugur*.

The first, or *k*, group shows that the root has taken the suffix *ka*, and *drukē*, &c., must be referred back to a low Sanskrit **dr-ava-ka-ti*.

¹ It must not be supposed that the *n* and *l* forms are the only cases of Sanskrit roots with nominal suffixes.

As Brugmann (ii. 1020 and ff.) shows, there are many parallel instances. E. g., ✓ *bhās* (*bhā-sa-ti*) 'shine' is really a denominative, based on the ✓ *bhā* (*bhā-ti*), with the nominal suffix *sa*. So also many other roots in *s*. Again stems in *cch* (e. g., *gacchati*, 'he goes') are old denominatives, with the nominal termination *ska* (prakritized to *cch*) added. Thus *gacchati* is for *ga-ska-ti*. Again many roots in *t* are denominatives formed from nouns in *ta*. Thus from ✓ *ci* (*ci-nō-ti*, 'he sets in order,' also a denominative form), we have the past participle *ci-ta*, and also the root *ci-t* (*cē-ta-ti*, 'he understands'); so also from ✓ *yam*, we have the present *ya-ccha-ti* (i. e., *ya-ska-ti*), or (Vedic) *yam-a-ti*, 'he supports,' the past participle *ya-ta*, and the denominative verb *ya-t* (*ya-ta-tē*, 'he connects').

² The *dh* in this form is due to confusion with another root, *dhāv* having the same meaning.

H.-c., iv, 398, especially authorises the retention of the *r* in *druk* in the Western Pañjāb, where Apabhraṃṣa was spoken; and in iv, 396 allows the *k* to be retained, or changed to *g*,¹ instead of the elision which we should expect in Prakrit.

The second or *ḍ* group, shows that the root took the suffix *ḍa*, so that *daurē*, &c., must be referred to a low Sanskrit **dr-ava-ḍa-ti*. Finally, the Naipāli form *dugur*, is an instance of both suffixes, which (H.-c., iv, 430) may be used together in the same word. *Dugurē*, represents a low Sanskrit form **dr-ava-ka-ḍa-ti*.

Other instances of these pleonastic suffixes occur in Prakrit, in forming causals. Thus we have² *bhamāḍḍēi* (beside the regular *bhamā-vēi*) causal of ✓ *bhram* 'roam' (H.-c., iii, 151; iv, 30, 161), *tamāḍḍai*, 'he causes to roam' (H.-c., iv, 30), *dhamśāḍḍai*, 'he looses' (H.-c., iv, 91).

We also find them in the case of other modern vernacular verbs, as well as ✓ *daur*, though the lessons obtained from them are not so complete. Thus modern ✓ *ṭahal* or *ṭahar*, 'wait' (Skr. ✓ *sthā*), ✓ *laygar*, 'limp' (Skr. ✓ *lagg*), ✓ *jhapat* 'spring upon' (Skr. ✓ *jhamp*), and many others in which a pleonastic *l*, *r*, *ḍ*, or even *ṭ* has been added (Cf. Hoernle, Gd. Gr., 178).

The above remarks make the origin of these irregular causal suffixes, and also of the irregular Rājputānī (Mārwārī) Passive in *r-ij*, clear. These suffixes are specially common in Sanskrit in the case of Denominative verbs, and, the close connexion between Causals, Denominatives, and Passives need not be insisted upon. The pleonastic character of the suffixes is shown by their use in the I. A. V's. They are most commonly added to monosyllabic roots ending in a vowel, *i. e.*, the roots which are weakest in form, and require the strengthening given of a consonant. In other cases, their use is almost optional. *E. g.*, H. has ✓ *sikh-ā* as well as ✓ *sikh-l-ā*, ✓ *dikh-ā*, 'cause to see,' as well as *dikh-l-ā*, and so on. Finally their apparently capricious use, sometimes preceding, and sometimes following the true causal suffix, is strongly characteristic of their pleonastic character.

As regards the derivation of each of these modern suffixes, I connect the *l* with the Pr. *lla*. The Kāçmiri *ana*, may be the Skr. *anya* (used for forming denominatives), or it may be derived from the Pr. *lla*. The *ḍ* and *r* forms, are naturally to be referred to the Pr. *ḍa*, from which, moreover, it is possible that the *l* forms are also derived.

¹ Cf. Skr. *ḍag* (*ḍa-ga-ti*), *gamanē*.

² Also quoted by Hoernle, Gd. Gr., 321.